

PAUL J. RIEHLE (SBN 115199)  
paul.riehle@faegredrinker.com  
**FAEGRE DRINKER BIDDLE & REATH  
LLP**  
Four Embarcadero Center  
San Francisco, California 94111  
Telephone: (415) 591-7500  
Facsimile: (415) 591-7510

GARY A. BORNSTEIN (*pro hac vice*)  
gbornstein@cravath.com  
YONATAN EVEN (*pro hac vice*)  
yeven@cravath.com  
LAUREN A. MOSKOWITZ (*pro hac vice*)  
lmoskowitz@cravath.com  
JUSTIN C. CLARKE (*pro hac vice*)  
jcclarke@cravath.com  
MICHAEL J. ZAKEN (*pro hac vice*)  
mzaken@cravath.com  
M. BRENT BYARS (*pro hac vice*)  
mbyars@cravath.com  
**CRAVATH, SWAINE & MOORE LLP**  
375 Ninth Avenue  
New York, New York 10001  
Telephone: (212) 474-1000  
Facsimile: (212) 474-3700

*Attorneys for Plaintiff and Counter-defendant  
Epic Games, Inc.*

RICHARD J. DOREN, SBN 124666  
rdoren@gibsondunn.com  
DANIEL G. SWANSON, SBN 116556  
dswanson@gibsondunn.com  
JASON C. LO, SBN 219030  
jlo@gibsondunn.com  
**GIBSON, DUNN & CRUTCHER LLP**  
333 South Grand Avenue  
Los Angeles, CA 90071-3197  
Telephone: 213.229.7000  
Facsimile: 213.229.7520

CYNTHIA E. RICHMAN (D.C. Bar No.  
492089; *pro hac vice*)  
crichman@gibsondunn.com  
**GIBSON, DUNN & CRUTCHER LLP**  
1050 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20036-5306  
Telephone: 202.955.8500  
Facsimile: 202.467.0539

JULIAN W. KLEINBRODT, SBN 302085  
jkleinbrodt@gibsondunn.com  
**GIBSON, DUNN & CRUTCHER LLP**  
One Embarcadero Center, Suite 2600  
San Francisco, CA 94111  
Telephone: 415.393.8200  
Facsimile: 415.393.8306

MARK A. PERRY, SBN 212532  
mark.perry@weil.com  
JOSHUA M. WESNESKI (D.C. Bar No.  
1500231; *pro hac vice* pending)  
joshua.wesneski@weil.com  
**WEIL, GOTSHAL & MANGES LLP**  
2001 M Street NW, Suite 600  
Washington, DC 20036  
Telephone: 202.682.7000  
Facsimile: 202.857.0940

*Attorneys for Defendant and Counterclaimant  
Apple Inc.*

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
OAKLAND DIVISION**

EPIC GAMES, INC.,  
  
Plaintiff, Counter-defendant,  
  
v.  
  
APPLE INC.,  
  
Defendant, Counterclaimant.

Case No. 4:20-CV-05640-YGR-TSH

**JOINT STATUS REPORT RE  
SPECIAL MASTER REVIEW**

Courtroom: 1, 4th Floor

Judge: Hon. Yvonne Gonzalez Rogers

Pursuant to the Standing Order for All Judges of the Northern District of California, Civil Local Rule 16-9, the Court’s Standing Order in Civil Cases, and the Court’s Minute Entry of January 14, 2025 (Dkt. 1117), Plaintiff and Counter-defendant Epic Games, Inc. (“Epic”), and Defendant and Counterclaimant Apple Inc. (“Apple”; Apple and Epic together, the “Parties,” and each individually, a “Party”), by and through their undersigned counsel, hereby submit this Joint Status Report Re Special Master Review.

**EPIC’S STATEMENT:**

Despite this Court’s Order on May 31, 2024, requiring Apple to produce “all of Apple’s documents relative to the decision-making process leading to the link entitlement and associated commission rates” (Dkt. 974), Apple initially withheld around 55,000 documents for privilege after producing just under 100,000 documents to Epic. Epic raised concerns about this exceedingly high privilege withholding rate, and those concerns were well founded—as a result of its re-review process, Apple withdrew well over half of its privilege claims (30,104 out of 53,820), downgrading almost 56% of its withheld documents and conceding that those are entirely *not* privileged.

By January 14, the last time the Parties appeared before the Court, Apple’s weekly privilege downgrade rates clearly showed that Apple had been abusing privilege, thereby delaying the contempt proceedings against it for months. Therefore, and to avoid further delay, Epic asked this Court to stop Apple’s re-review process and sanction Apple by holding that it waived its privilege through its massive campaign of over-withholding. At the time, although the Court recognized that Apple’s privilege review was “in large part . . . delay” and “totally a tactic”, the Court declined Epic’s invitation. (Jan. 14, 2025 Case Mgmt. Conf. Tr. 23:20-24.)

Instead, the Court ordered the Parties to report back on the progress of the Special Masters’ review as of the end of January, stating that, at that point, and to avoid further delay, the Court may halt that process and itself re-review a selection of the documents yet to be ruled upon by the Special Masters as a “backstop”. (Jan. 14, 2025 Case Mgmt. Conf. Tr. 23:12-16.) The Court further warned Apple that there would “be consequences for the choices that [Apple] made”. (Jan. 14, 2025 Case Mgmt. Conf. Tr. 23:25-24:1.)

1 Epic accordingly provides the Court with an update. Specifically, as of last night, after  
 2 nearly six weeks of review, the Special Masters have reviewed roughly 5,500 documents. But  
 3 while the rate of Special Master review has increased significantly, there are still over **18,000**  
 4 documents left for their review as of today. This is partly because, since January 14, Apple  
 5 doubled down on its delay and abuse tactics: in the days immediately following the last status  
 6 conference, Apple funneled many more documents than before to the Special Masters, including  
 7 many that appear to be the most core documents in this case, knowing full well that the Special  
 8 Masters would be unlikely to get to review these documents and adjudicate Apple's privilege  
 9 assertions. Apple thus once again created for itself a win-win situation: either Epic is denied the  
 10 documents it is entitled to, or Apple's day of reckoning is again delayed by many months. To  
 11 break this logjam, Epic again asks the Court to sanction Apple and find that it has waived  
 12 privilege over the documents the Special Masters have yet to review.<sup>1</sup>

13 \* \* \*

14 On January 13, Apple told the Special Masters that it estimated they would have  
 15 "somewhere in the neighborhood of 16 or 17 [thousand documents] across all the privilege  
 16 productions from the beginning until the end". (Jan. 13, 2025 Special Master Conf. Tr. 79:12-15,  
 17 80:12-23.) The next day, when the parties were last before this Court, Apple represented that it  
 18 had already identified 17,998 documents over which it was maintaining its privilege assertions,  
 19 with 9,920 left to re-review for privilege. (Jan. 14, 2025 Case Mgmt. Conf. 13:20-23). This  
 20 Court made clear it will not defer the resumption of the hearings by months, which Apple knew it  
 21 could exploit, as the Special Masters will not get the chance to review superfluous documents  
 22 Apple sent their way. Accordingly, three days later, the number of documents over which Apple  
 23 maintained an assertion of privilege had climbed to 23,716 (by Apple's own count). (Email from  
 24 J. Wesneski to Epic counsel on Jan. 22, 2025 at 11:17 a.m. PST.)

25  
 26  
 27 <sup>1</sup> Apple complains of "prejudice", but Epic's position is neither new or surprising. The  
 28 Parties just last night filed a Joint Status Report with Judge Hixson where Epic raised the very  
 same concerns. And Epic's renewed request for sanctions is hardly surprising in light of those  
 concerns.

1 In the final four days of re-review, then, the universe of documents over which Apple  
 2 maintained a claim of privilege increased by over 40%.<sup>2</sup> For the sake of comparison, Apple's  
 3 January 13 estimate reflected an expected downgrade rate of nearly 70%; yet in the last four days  
 4 of its re-review, Apple's downgrade rate declined to roughly 42%, far below its rate in the  
 5 preceding four weeks.<sup>3</sup>

6 The Special Masters expressed concern at the January 13 Status Conference that they may  
 7 only be able to review 300-400 documents each per week (900-1,200 per week collectively).  
 8 Apple's astounding final production over the following week made them "really concerned about  
 9 the timing" of concluding their review. (Jan. 24, 2025 Special Master Conf. 8:15-16.) Although  
 10 the Special Masters' rate of review has increased over the past two weeks, their current pace  
 11 suggests their review would not be complete until April at the earliest.

12 Apple did not just drastically reduce its *rate* of downgrades in the final days of the re-  
 13 review process. Although Apple represented that its re-review process was based on a "random  
 14 selection" of documents (Dec. 20, 2024 Discovery Hearing at 5:12-16), the *kinds* of documents  
 15 Apple produced to the Special Masters in the last week of its re-review raises serious concerns  
 16 that this was not the case. Specifically, it appears that Apple waited until the final days of its re-  
 17 review to produce to the Special Masters the bulk of the documents that are most likely to be  
 18 relevant to the upcoming contempt proceedings. Take, for example, three of Apple's key  
 19 witnesses in the contempt proceedings: Carson Oliver, Alex Roman and Phil Schiller. 72% of all  
 20 assertedly privileged documents for which Mr. Oliver is a custodian were produced to the Special  
 21 Masters in the final production; for Mr. Roman, 68.7%; and for Mr. Schiller, just over 60%. All  
 22  
 23  
 24  
 25

---

26 <sup>2</sup> As one Special Master noted, "[t]he fifth production alone is more than the first four  
 27 combined". (Jan. 24, 2025 Special Master Conf. 8:9-11.)

28 <sup>3</sup> Apple's overall downgrade rate is roughly 56%—still remarkably high, but far lower than  
 the 70% Apple predicted just five days before completing its re-review.

1 of these documents are documents Apple knew the Special Masters are unlikely to have the  
2 chance to review—and Epic would thus be unable to use in the upcoming hearings.<sup>4</sup>

3 Epic believes Apple’s declining privilege downgrading rates have a singular reason: with  
4 the knowledge that its latest privilege assertions will not be reviewed by the Special Masters,  
5 Apple once again engaged in over-withholding, maintaining privilege assertions over a large  
6 number of documents that simply are not privileged. Consider just three examples:<sup>5</sup>

- 7 • Entry No. 1470 in Apple’s final privilege log, PRIV-APL-EG\_00162498, is a  
8 January 6, 2024 presentation, with the file name “Wisconsin”—Apple’s codename  
9 for its Injunction compliance project. The custodians of this presentation are Mr.  
10 Oliver and Ms. Thai—both non-lawyers. Apple seeks to withhold this presentation  
11 *in its entirety*, yet its privilege log does not name a single lawyer involved in its  
12 preparation; rather, it simply asserts the presentation “reflect[s] advice from Apple  
13 legal”.
- 14 • Entry No. 4706, PRIV-APL-EG\_00197353, is an email from Mr. Schiller to Fred  
15 Sainz, an Apple communications person, and to Kate Adams, Apple’s General  
16 Counsel, copying multiple business executives, communications personnel and  
17 attorneys. The email subject is “Re: HOT: White paper on DMA Privacy/Security  
18 Protections”. Nothing in the privilege log suggests the communication is legal in  
19 nature, let alone that it is made primarily to obtain legal advice. To the contrary,  
20 this appears to be an email concerning primarily Apple’s communications and  
21 public relations policy—the kind of communication this Court already had  
22 admonished Apple for trying to keep under wraps.

23  
24  
25 <sup>4</sup> Apple suggests this is the result of the fact it reviewed more documents in the final week of  
26 its re-review. But that does not explain the far lower rate of *downgrading* in the final days of the  
re-review.

27 <sup>5</sup> Apple now claims one of these documents is privileged in “substantial majority”, and  
28 another is one that Apple would have produced had it been asked. But Apple reviewed these  
documents twice over and decided to seek to withhold them *in their entirety*.

- Entry No. 7796, PRIV-APL-EG\_00226492, is a May 2023 presentation with the file name “Wisconsin Scenarios and Financial Impacts”. Apple seeks to withhold this presentation in its entirety, but its privilege log again does not list a single lawyer involved in its preparation; its custodians are Apple business executives and employees, including Messrs. Schiller, Oliver, Federighi and others; and its name suggests it is, at least in large part, a business presentation.

These examples are just the tip of the iceberg; Apple’s latest privilege log is replete with documents whose descriptions suggest they are substantive, relevant and *not* privileged. To further make this point, even without access to the underlying purportedly privileged documents, Epic encloses herewith, as **Exhibit A**, a list of 100 exemplar documents over which Apple maintained its privilege assertions but that Epic believes are substantive documents that are unlikely to be privileged. Should the Court decide to “spot check” Apple’s privilege assertions, as it warned Apple it might do (Jan. 14, 2025 Case Mgmt. Conf. Tr. 23:1-4), Epic respectfully suggests that the Court include review of these documents.<sup>6</sup> And, as noted above, Epic again requests the Court sanction Apple for its ongoing abuse of privilege. Apple was on notice that its conduct may result in sanctions; enough is enough.

### **APPLE’S STATEMENT:**

#### ***Numbers Requested by the Court***

Apple completed its production of documents to the Special Masters and Epic last week. On January 22, Apple provided the following metrics to Epic regarding the re-review:

**Total documents re-reviewed: 53,820**

#### **Categories**

**Category 1: 22,658**

**Category 2: 7,059**

---

<sup>6</sup> Apple’s suggestion that the way to address these documents is through the Protocol misses the point; the Protocol would result in months of further delay before Epic received documents it was entitled to obtain **by September 30, 2024**.

**Category 3:** 24,103

**Privilege assertions**

**Documents tagged “Not Privileged”:** 30,104

**Documents tagged “Privileged”:** 23,716

Out of the 53,820 documents reviewed, Apple downgraded approximately 55.9%. Excluding those downgrades that Apple contends were a result of Judge Hixson’s December 2 discovery order (i.e., the Category 2 documents), the downgrade percentage is approximately 42.1%.<sup>7</sup>

The following metrics represent the Special Masters’ progress as of the evening of January 30:

**Documents Ruled On:** 5,506

**Privilege Upheld in Full:** 4,906 (89.1%)

**Privilege Upheld in Part, Overruled in Part:** 46 (0.8%)

**Privileged Overruled in Full:** 554 (10.1%)

**Requests for Additional Information:** 89

The Special Masters estimated in early January that they would be able to collectively review approximately 1,000 documents in total per week. In the two weeks since then, the Special Masters have collectively exceeded that pace. Nevertheless, at a status conference on January 24, the Special Masters estimated that it will take them “at a minimum” through February or March to complete their review. *See* Hr’g Tr. 10:8–13, 12:11–14 (Jan. 24, 2025).

***Epic’s Submission***

---

<sup>7</sup> It is not accurate, as Epic contends, that Apple has “conced[ed]” that all of the downgraded documents are not privileged—Apple reserved all rights as to the documents identified in Category 2, which Apple maintains are privileged but acknowledges are affected by Judge Hixson’s and this Court’s orders in this case.



1 The Court requested in this joint update the “numbers” for the review undertaken so far.  
2 Hr’g Tr. 24:22 (Jan. 14, 2025). It did not ask for any other update from the parties. Fewer than  
3 five hours before this joint submission was due, Epic provided its draft joint submission to Apple  
4 for the first time (after unilaterally delaying the exchange scheduled for the previous night), which  
5 includes far more than a discussion of “numbers” and instead addresses documents and issues never  
6 before raised to Apple. And Epic’s initial account of the “numbers”—the only thing the Court  
7 actually requested—in its joint submission was off *by thousands of documents*. Only after Apple  
8 pointed this out did Epic correct the admitted “error.”  
9

10 Epic’s submission also included reference to an Exhibit A of some 100 documents. Epic  
11 has never raised these particular documents to Apple before *and did not provide this list to Apple*  
12 *until 10:20 AM PT*. This course of conduct is not consistent with the spirit of a joint statement  
13 exchange, and is highly prejudicial to Apple. That is particularly so given that the review Protocol,  
14 which has been entered as an order by this Court, provides a mechanism for either party to object  
15 to privilege determinations regarding particular documents. *See* Dkt. 1092 ¶ 4. Nevertheless,  
16 Apple provides here its responses to Epic’s arguments in the most complete form possible in this  
17 truncated timeframe while reserving the right to respond more completely as warranted.  
18

19 *First*, Epic accuses Apple of engaging in a “massive campaign” of over-designation of  
20 privilege. The evidence does not support these allegations, and they are untrue. Apple instructed  
21 the reviewers during the first phase of the document production to make good-faith assertions of  
22 privilege, applying the Ninth Circuit privilege standards. Any notion that Apple calibrated its  
23 privilege review to specifically impede the production of responsive documents is unsubstantiated  
24 and wrong—indeed, that would have required coordination among several major law firms, two  
25 outside consulting firms, and hundreds of outside attorneys.  
26

27 What the facts instead show is that Apple invested significant resources into timely  
28 reviewing and producing relevant documents. Owing to the high volume of documents under



1 review and the short timeframe for production, Apple enlisted several hundreds of reviewers to  
2 review these and tens of thousands of other documents (ultimately more than 1 million in total).  
3 Apple's outside counsel was able to quality control check only a relatively small percentage of *all*  
4 of those good-faith review decisions (including both documents withheld for privilege and  
5 documents *not* withheld for privilege). Those documents concern difficult issues of injunction  
6 compliance, regulatory investigations and responses, and other legal proceedings related to the App  
7 Store around the globe. Attorneys appeared on thousands of the documents as a result, making the  
8 privilege determinations more complex than many other document productions concerning purely  
9 business issues.  
10

11 The current downgrades are the result of review by a small (~100) group of attorneys,  
12 undertaking a document-by-document review of only the issue of privilege and applying this  
13 Court's subsequent orders and additional guidance. All of this review was done pursuant to a  
14 protocol agreed to by Epic and entered as an order by the Court. Apple has adhered to that protocol  
15 and reviewed tens of thousands of documents in a matter of weeks. As the statistics above indicate,  
16 the Special Masters have overwhelmingly upheld Apple's privilege assertions.  
17

18 *Second*, Epic's speculation and allegations about a deliberate change in review standards  
19 midstream are baseless. Apple did not instruct its ~100 privilege reviewers to increase (or decrease)  
20 the frequency of their privilege assertions following the status conference with the Special Masters  
21 on January 13, 2025 or at any other time. Apple always provides iterative guidance to reviewers  
22 during a review, but in this case, that iterative guidance consisted largely of advising reviewers  
23 about the kinds of documents the Special Masters were *not* upholding as privileged. Apple made  
24 no intentional effort to change the frequency of its privilege assertions.  
25

26 Nor would it have made sense for Apple to do so. At Epic's insistence, every single  
27 document over which Apple is asserting privilege must be reviewed by the Special Masters. If  
28 Apple were to make an overbroad claim of privilege, that would be rooted out by the Special

1 Masters. Moreover, Apple has known since the beginning of this project that the review by the  
2 Special Masters would be the stopgap. *See* Hr’g Tr. 17:20–24 (Dec. 18, 2024). Epic’s implicit  
3 assumption that three Special Masters could responsibly review tens of thousands of documents in  
4 a matter of weeks—essentially the same project Apple employed ~100 reviewers to complete—has  
5 no basis in reality or this Court’s orders. That would be true under any of Apple’s periodic estimates  
6 of the likely review population.

7  
8 Epic speculates that Apple changed its review protocol because Apple “knows” its privilege  
9 assertions will not be reviewed by the Special Masters. Apple did not change its review protocol  
10 and has no such “knowledge.” Rather, Apple is under a Court order to submit each and every  
11 document over which it claims privilege to the Special Masters for review. *See* Dkt. 1092. That  
12 was the protocol *Epic* proposed and to which Apple agreed. To the extent Epic is saying it now  
13 intends to abandon that protocol, this filing is the first time it has made that suggestion. Unless and  
14 until the Court relieves the Special Masters of their obligations—and to be clear, Apple has no  
15 intention of requesting that it do so, regardless of when the evidentiary hearing resumes—each and  
16 every one of Apple’s privilege assertions will be reviewed by a disinterested Special Master. The  
17 statistics so far strongly indicate Apple’s privilege assertions will be upheld in significant part.

18  
19 Epic notes various estimates Apple made near the end of the review about the total  
20 population of privileged documents. Apple provided a rough estimate on January 13 of the number  
21 of documents it anticipated would be produced *after* its fourth production to the Special Masters.  
22 While repeatedly caveating the estimate, Apple estimated an additional 8,000 to 10,000 documents  
23 *after* the fourth production (i.e., on top of the 10,030 documents produced through the fourth  
24 production). *See* Hr’g Tr. 74:16–75:6 (Jan. 13, 2025). After Epic’s counsel repeatedly pushed  
25 back, Apple’s counsel estimated that it would be *at least* 17,000 documents in total. *See id.* at 79:5–  
26 17. Apple cannot be faulted for giving its best estimates in real-time based on the knowledge it had  
27 available during the conference.  
28

1        *Third*, Epic now asserts (for the first time in this submission) that Apple may have  
2 strategically pushed some documents to the back of the re-review queue. Again, that is not true  
3 and there is no evidence for it. Apple did not sort documents for review based on custodian, subject  
4 matter, or any other metric. The only instruction it gave its vendor was to keep “family” member  
5 documents (e.g., emails and their attachments) together for purposes of the review. It is not even  
6 clear to Apple how it *could* have organized the review in the way Epic speculates, given the large  
7 number of custodians and the variety of documents in the production. If the suggestion is that  
8 Apple’s counsel searched through all 54,000 documents, identified a few thousand that were of the  
9 greatest interest, and segregated them from the population, that did not happen and there is  
10 absolutely no evidence to substantiate that claim.

12        The statistics Epic presents are highly misleading. Epic notes that of the documents with  
13 Alex Roman, Phil Schiller, or Carson Oliver as a custodian over which Apple has maintained  
14 privilege, between 60–70% appear on the final log. But because Apple reviewed a substantially  
15 higher number of documents in the final week, the final privilege log represents approximately  
16 57.8% of *all* documents over which Apple maintains privilege—regardless of custodian. Epic  
17 conspicuously omits any statistics as to Matt Fischer, the fourth witness from the hearing, whose  
18 allocation of documents in the final privilege log (~56.1%) was in line with the overall distribution  
19 of privileged documents. The percentages Epic cites for three particular custodians are therefore  
20 not evidence of any strategic ordering as to particular custodians.

22        *Fourth*, Epic identifies three documents in Apple’s final privilege log that it claims may not  
23 be privileged. The process for objecting to documents over which Apple has asserted privilege is  
24 set forth in the Protocol, and there is no process in place for either party to short-circuit both the  
25 Special Masters *and* Judge Hixson in order to pursue immediate review from Your Honor. Based  
26 only on a quick review, though:

- Entry No. 1470 is a slide deck for internal presentation whose speaker notes indicate it was delivered in substantial majority by in-house counsel and that includes numerous comments from another in-house counsel.
- Entry No. 4706, as Epic admits, is an email sent to Apple’s General Counsel, and as Apple has briefed before Judge Hixson, the fact that legal advice is sought on a business matter does not render a communication non-privileged.
- Entry No. 7796 appears to have already been produced to Epic from two other custodians (APL-EG\_11391659 and APL-EG\_11467957). Had Epic raised this with Apple prior to the joint submission, Apple could have produced this version as well (it not unusual for the same document to receive different treatment from different reviewers).

Epic also provides an Exhibit identifying 100 additional documents it contends may not be privileged. Epic did not provide this list of documents to Apple until 10:20 AM PT. Apple has had no opportunity to review the list at any level of detail. But in any event, as Apple has noted, the parties have an agreed-upon Protocol, developed jointly by the parties and entered by the Court as an order, for evaluating Apple’s privilege claims. Even if Epic might be dissatisfied with the high rate at which the Special Masters are upholding Apple’s privilege assertions, that is no basis to now jettison the process that the parties agreed to and the Court accepted.

Epic’s suggestion that the Court’s “spot check” include 100 documents curated by Epic is not tenable—looking only at the documents identified by an opposing party is not a “spot check” and will tell the Court nothing about Apple’s overall privilege efforts. In a recent status hearing, one of the Special Masters also expressed concern whether any “spot check” would be effective because “[t]here are different kinds of groupings and I don’t know how you would select randomly different things to give you a sampling to rule on.” Hr’g Tr. 17:8–16 (Jan. 24, 2025). If Epic would

1 like to brief the newly identified documents on an expedited basis before Magistrate Judge Hixson  
2 and receive a ruling as to *those* documents, Apple is willing to do so (and that is the normal way in  
3 which privilege disputes are handled). But again, Epic never raised any of those documents before  
4 the morning of January 31, just hours before this submission is due. In any event, if Epic seeks to  
5 provide exemplars for the Court as illustrative of Apple's privilege re-review, then Apple would  
6 request the same opportunity.

7  
8 *Finally*, Epic renews its request that the Court declare all of Apple's privilege assertions  
9 waived. This Court already indicated it was not inclined to issue that relief. *See* Hr'g Tr. 23:5–11.  
10 There are no new facts since then to justify such relief now. Epic's speculation about some change  
11 in Apple's review standards or a strategic ordering of documents is both unsubstantiated and wrong.  
12 In fact, at the hearing, counsel for Epic was clear: "The issue is not the rereview." *Id.* at 10:20. At  
13 the very least, the Court should receive full briefing before ordering such a drastic remedy.

1 Dated: January 31, 2025

Respectfully submitted,

2 By: /s/ Yonatan Even

3 **FAEGRE DRINKER BIDDLE & REATH**  
4 **LLP**

5 Paul J. Riehle (SBN 115199)  
6 paul.riehle@faegredrinker.com

7 Four Embarcadero Center  
8 San Francisco, California 94111  
9 Telephone: (415) 591-7500  
Facsimile: (415) 591-7510

10 **CRAVATH, SWAINE & MOORE LLP**

11 Gary A. Bornstein (*pro hac vice*)  
12 gbornstein@cravath.com  
Yonatan Even (*pro hac vice*)  
yeven@cravath.com  
13 Lauren A. Moskowitz (*pro hac vice*)  
lmoskowitz@cravath.com  
14 Justin C. Clarke (*pro hac vice*)  
jcclarke@cravath.com  
15 Michael J. Zaken (*pro hac vice*)  
mzaken@cravath.com  
16 M. Brent Byars (*pro hac vice*)  
mbyars@cravath.com

17  
18 375 Ninth Avenue  
New York, New York 10001  
19 Telephone: (212) 474-1000  
20 Facsimile: (212) 474-3700

21 *Attorneys for Plaintiff and Counter-defendant*  
22 *Epic Games, Inc.*  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

1 Dated: January 31, 2025

Respectfully submitted,

2 By: /s/ Mark A. Perry

3  
4 **WEIL, GOTSHAL & MANGES LLP**

5 Mark A. Perry  
6 Joshua M. Wesneski

7 **GIBSON, DUNN & CRUTCHER LLP**

8 Richard J. Doren  
9 Jason C. Lo  
10 Daniel G. Swanson  
11 Cynthia E. Richman  
12 Julian W. Kleinbrodt

13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
*Attorneys for Defendant and Counter-claimant*  
APPLE INC.



**E-FILING ATTESTATION**

I, Yonatan Even, am the ECF User whose ID and password are being used to file this document. In compliance with Civil Local Rule 5-1(i)(3), I hereby attest that each of the signatories identified above has concurred in this filing.

/s/ Yonatan Even  
Yonatan Even